

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed January 29, 2003, no claims have been cancelled or amended. Claim 20 has been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-14 and 16-20 are pending. Applicants note that the Application as-filed did not include a claim 15. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

A. **CLARIFICATION**

In the Office Action Summary for the Final Office Action mailed January 29, 2003 (Paper No. 15), the Examiner recites that the Office Action is responsive to communication(s) filed on “26 November 2002.” In addition, at pg. 2, ¶1 of the Office Action, the Examiner further recites that the “*action is responsive to...amendment filed 11/26/02.*”

Applicants wish to clarify, for the record, that the aforementioned Amendment was timely filed and received by the U.S. Patent Office on November 25, 2002. In a facsimile transmission to Examiner Singh dated December 16, 2002, Applicants attached a copy of the stamped postcard from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (as **EXHIBIT A**) acknowledging a receipt date of November 25, 2002. In the Final Office Action, at pg. 6, ¶8, the Examiner acknowledges receipt of this postcard, yet has still improperly indicated the Amendment date as November 26, 2002.

B. **DRAWINGS**

Applicants filed a "Request for Approval of Drawing Corrections to FIGS. 5 and 7" on **November 25, 2002**, requesting Examiner approval of drawing corrections to FIGS. 5 and 7.

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner failed to indicate whether the corrected drawings have been approved. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner please indicate whether the proposed drawing corrections filed on **November 25, 2002** have been approved.

C. **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (I.D.S.)**

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement ("I.D.S.") was filed by Applicants on **November 25, 2002**. To date, Applicants have not received a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 from the Examiner indicating that the references were considered. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the References submitted with the **November 25, 2002** I.D.S. and return a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 with the next communication. A copy of the **November 25, 2002** I.D.S. is provided herewith as **APPENDIX A**.

D. **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

1. Independent claims 1, 8, and 16, and dependent claims 2 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ainsbury *et al.* ("Ainsbury") (U.S. Patent No. 6,078,924) in view of Clancey *et al.* ("Clancey") (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,563). *See* **Final Office Action, pg. 2, ¶4.**

2. Dependent claims 3-4, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Ainsbury and Clancey, further in view of Siow *et al.* ("Siow") (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,590). **See Final Office Action, pg. 3, ¶5.**

3. Dependent claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 17, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Ainsbury and Clancey, further in view of Comer *et al.* ("Comer") (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,293). **See Final Office Action, pg. 4, ¶6.**

4. Dependent claims 6, 13, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Ainsbury, Clancey, and Comer, further in view of Broman *et al.* ("Broman") (U.S. Patent No. 7,754,858). **See Final Office Action, pg. 5, ¶7.**

Applicants traverse.

A. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). With regard to independent claims 1, 8, and 16, the Examiner concedes that Ainsbury fails to teach all of the claim elements:

"Ainsbury does not disclose a means for generating a spreadsheet application for the report or a transmitting means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within the page over a network." **See Final Office Action, pg. 2, ¶4.**

The Examiner relies on Clancey to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Ainsbury. However, in the Examiner's characterization of Clancey, provided below, the Examiner fails to point out

where the claimed feature of “*a transmitting means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within a page over the network...*” is either disclosed or suggested by Clancey:

“Clancey teaches a system in which reports can be used to summarize, organize, calculate and analyze data. Clancey discloses that a spreadsheet program such as Microsoft Excel can be used to create the report in a form of an electronic spreadsheet consisting of matrix of rows and columns for displaying values, text, and for calculating values. The spreadsheet can also be formatted to vary the presentation of information contained within the report. The spreadsheet program can automatically enter information into the cells. Clancey teaches a means in which a spreadsheet application is incorporated into a report.” **See Final Office Action, pgs. 2-3, ¶4.**

For at least the reason that the Examiner concedes that Ainsbury does not disclose the claimed feature of “*a transmitting means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within a page over the network...*,” and because the Examiner never articulates how this feature is disclosed or suggested by Clancey, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish obviousness for the rejection under §103(a) based on Ainsbury in view of Clancey.

B. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner states:

“In regards (sic) to claims 1, 8, and 16, Applicant argues that Ainsbury discloses neither the report presenting means for generating a spreadsheet application for the report, nor the transmission means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within a page over the network to a user system to be displayed in the network user interface.” **See Final Office Action, pg. 6, ¶9.**

This is not accurate. By contrast, Applicants noted that the Examiner conceded that Ainsbury failed to disclose these claim features in the First Office Action (Paper No. 9), at pg. 2, ¶4.

Moreover, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner recites:

“As stated in the previous office action and the rejections above, Ainsbury teaches a method and apparatus for information browsing, querying, analysis, and report creation. In light of Clancey, both Ainsbury and Clancey teach a system of generating a spreadsheet application and transmitting the application within a page to the network user. See rejections above.” **See Final Office Action, pg. 6, ¶9.**

In response, and as discussed above, Applicants again note that the Examiner (in the Final Office Action, at pg. 2, ¶4) acknowledges that Ainsbury does not disclose the claimed feature of “*a transmitting means for transmitting the spreadsheet application within a page over the network...*” Additionally, in the Final Office Action, at pgs. 2-3, ¶4, the Examiner never articulates how this particular feature is disclosed or suggested by Clancey. As such, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish obviousness for the rejection under §103(a) based on Ainsbury in view of Clancey.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, teach all of the limitations of independent claims 1, 8, and 16. Accordingly, Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 17-19 are allowable because they depend from allowable independent claims, as well as for the further limitations they contain.


**CONCLUSION**

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC

By:   
Bradford C. Blaise – Reg. No. 47,429  
for: James G. Gatto – Reg. No. 32,694

Date: **May 29, 2003**

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC  
12010 Sunset Hills Road  
Suite 900  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
(703) 464-4800 (Telephone)  
(703) 464-4895 (Facsimile)

**APPENDIX A**

Copy of November 25, 2002 I.D.S.